

# THE GENERAL BOARD

United States Forces, European Theater

## RECLASSIFICATION AND DEMOTION OF OFFICERS

### IN THE EUROPEAN THEATER OF OPERATIONS

MISSION: Prepare a Factual Annotated Report of the Operations of Officer Reclassification and Demotion Policies and Procedure in this Theater.

The General Board was established by General Orders 128, Headquarters, European Theater of Operations, U. S. Army, dated 17 June 1945, as amended by General Orders 182, dated 7 August 1945, and General Orders 312, dated 20 November 1945, Headquarters, European Theater of Operations, U. S. Army, to prepare a factual analysis of the strategy, tactics, and administration employed by the U. S. Forces in the European Theater.

File: R 210.01/1

Study Number 7

Proposed by  
Office of the Chief  
Military Historian  
General Reference Branch

THE GENERAL BOARD  
UNITED STATES FORCES, EUROPEAN THEATER  
APO 408

RECLASSIFICATION AND DENOTION OF OFFICERS  
IN THE EUROPEAN THEATER OF OPERATIONS

Prepared by:

Colonel Charles W. Van Way, Jr., 015757, GSC, Chief,  
G-1 Section.

Colonel Emil W. Loard, 04626, Infantry, Reclassification  
Board European Theater of Operations.

Colonel Harvey T. Morgan, 011380, Infantry, Reclassifica-  
tion Board European Theater of Operations.

Principal Consultants:

Colonel Bertrand Morrow, 05301, Cavalry, President, Re-  
classification Board, European Theater of Operations.

Colonel Frederick S. Matthews, 05625, GSC, Assistant  
Chief of Staff, G-1, Third Army.

Colonel Thomas Robinson, 015395, AGD, Adjutant General,  
Third Army.

Colonel William E. Craig, 019526, GSC, Assistant Chief  
of Staff, G-1, Seventh Army.

Colonel Theodore A. Seely, 016344, Infantry, Regimental  
Commander, 28th Division.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUBJECT	PAGE
Chapter 1: General Procedure . . . . .	1
Chapter 2: Reclassification Boards . . . . .	3
Chapter 3: Causes of Reclassification. . . . .	7
Chapter 4: Reclassification of Flying Officers . . . . .	10
Chapter 5: Disposition of Officers . . . . .	12
Chapter 6: Recorders . . . . .	13
Chapter 7: Centralization. . . . .	14
Chapter 8: Conclusions . . . . .	14
Chapter 9: Recommendations . . . . .	15

## APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Section 76, The National Defense Act.	
Appendix 2 - Section II, Circular No. 11, Headquarters ETOUSA, 3 July 1942.	
Appendix 3 - Section I, Circular No. 13, Headquarters ETOUSA, 15 July 1942.	
Appendix 4 - Section III, Circular No. 26, Headquarters ETOUSA, 15 August 1942.	
Appendix 5 - Section I, Circular No. 16, Headquarters ETOUSA, 17 February 1943.	
Appendix 6 - Sections I, II, and III, Circular No. 68, Headquarters ETOUSA, 27 August 1943.	
Appendix 7 - Section I, Circular No. 95, Headquarters ETOUSA, 6 December 1943.	
Appendix 8 - Section II, Circular No. 27, Headquarters ETOUSA, 15 March 1944.	
Appendix 9 - Section II, Circular No. 70, Headquarters ETOUSA, 14 June 1944.	
Appendix 10 - Section III, Circular No. 95, Headquarters ETOUSA, 31 August 1944.	
Appendix 11 - Section VI, Circular No. 100, Headquarters ETOUSA, 10 October 1944.	
Appendix 12 - Letter, Headquarters ETOUSA, AG 210.01 HPOB, 25 August 1944, Subject: "Reclassification Procedure".	

- Appendix 13 - Letter, Headquarters WFOUSA, AG 210.01 (MPG), 18 September 1944, Subject: "Reclassification Procedure".
- Appendix 14 - Letter, Headquarters ETOUSA, AG 210.01, 4 October 1944, Subject: "Procedure in Reclassification Cases".
- Appendix 15 - Sample copy of work sheet on which findings of fact, discussion, conclusion, and recommendations were prepared for each reclassification case.
- Appendix 16 - Memorandum No. 75-2, Headquarters Eighth Air Force, 23 August 1943, Subject: "Combat Crew Personnel Failures".
- Appendix 17 - Letter, Headquarters Eighth Air Force, 6 July 1943, Subject: "Classification of Psychiatric Disorders Among Flying Personnel".
- Appendix 18 - Letter, Headquarters Army Air Forces, 7 December 1944, Subject: "Lack of Incentive for Flying and Unwillingness or Refusal to Meet Military Stresses".
- Appendix 19 - Informal memorandum for Brigadier General Malcolm C. Grow from Colonel George L. Ball, MC, dated 30 December 1944, on the subject of medical responsibilities in connection with qualification for flying duty.

THE GENERAL BOARD  
UNITED STATES FORCES, EUROPEAN THEATER  
APO 408

RECLASSIFICATION AND DEMOTION OF OFFICERS  
IN THE EUROPEAN THEATER OF OPERATIONS

CHAPTER 1

GENERAL PROCEDURE

1. General. Reclassification and demotion of officers in the European Theater of Operations was accomplished under the provisions of Army Regulations 605-230, dated 9 June 1943, as amended by Changes 1 to 4 inclusive; Section I, War Department Circular 280, dated 5 November 1943; and Section 76, National Defense Act, as amended.<sup>1</sup>

2. Reclassification Jurisdiction. Jurisdiction over reclassification of officers was, by direction of the War Department, retained by the European Theater Commander and was not delegated to subordinate commanders.

3. Theater Directives. The original directives under which the European Theater of Operations Reclassification Board operated were contained in Section II, Circular 11, Headquarters European Theater of Operations, dated 8 July 1942;<sup>2</sup> Section I, Circular 13, dated 15 July 1942;<sup>3</sup> and Section III, Circular 26, dated 15 August 1942.<sup>4</sup> The policies announced therein were reestablished and amended by the following: Section I, Circular 16, dated 17 February 1943;<sup>5</sup> Section I, Circular 68, dated 27 August 1943;<sup>6</sup> Section I, Circular 95, dated 6 December 1943;<sup>7</sup> Section II, Circular 27, dated 15 March 1944;<sup>8</sup> Section II, Circular 70, dated 14 June 1944;<sup>9</sup> Section III, Circular 95, dated 31 August 1944;<sup>10</sup> Section VI, Circular 100, dated 10 October 1944;<sup>11</sup> letters to the Commanding General, 12th Army Group, dated 25 August<sup>12</sup> and 18 September 1944,<sup>13</sup> and to the President of the European Theater Reclassification Board, dated 4 October 1944.<sup>14</sup>

4. Purpose. "The purpose of reclassification is to provide a means for the disposition of officers who are inefficient or otherwise unsuitable in their current assignments, either by reassignment to a position which they are capable of handling efficiently, demotion to a grade commensurate with their qualifications, or separation from commissioned service".<sup>15</sup>

5. To Whom Applicable. The regulations governing reclassification "are applicable to officers of all components of the Army of the United States."<sup>16</sup>

6. Disciplinary Action. Reclassification procedure is administrative in character, and is not intended to be used in lieu of court-martial procedure or action under the provisions of Article of War 104. However, "offenses committed by an officer, which may be punishable by court-martial, may also cause the officer to perform his duties inefficiently, or evidence his unsuitability for continued commissioned status. In such cases, reclassification proceedings may be initiated irrespective of whether or not specific offenses have resulted in court-martial or other disciplinary action. A statement of the disciplinary action taken, if any, will be included in the reclassification papers."<sup>17</sup>

7. Time Limit. "An officer may be ordered to appear before a reclassification board at any time without regard to the length of time

he has served on active duty. #18

8. Who May Initiate. "The immediate or any higher commander may initiate reclassification proceedings on any officer permanently or temporarily assigned or attached to a command. #19

9. Procedure. When a commander considers that an officer of his command is not performing satisfactorily the duties to which he has been assigned, and there is no duty to which the officer can be transferred within his command, he so reports to his next higher commander. The latter, or his representative, in the case of a general officer, if he concurs in the reclassification action, conducts a personal interview of the officer considered for reclassification, in the presence of the initiating officer, and prepares a formal report of the interview in the form prescribed in Army Regulations 605-230. If the interviewing officer recommends formal reclassification, the officer initiating reclassification addresses to the Adjutant General of the Army, and forwards to the next higher commander, the following papers:

a. Recommendation for reclassification board action on Form A, as prescribed in Paragraph 16, Army Regulations 605-230.

b. Full efficiency report for the period involved.

c. WD AGO Form 66-1 (Officers' and Warrant Officers' Qualification Card) completed to date.

d. Sworn statements from the available witnesses having knowledge of the facts in the case.

e. Sworn statements of available witnesses submitted in behalf of the officer concerned.

f. Receipt signed by the officer concerned for all documents furnished him.

g. Certificate of the officer concerned that he has been afforded full opportunity to submit evidence in his own behalf.

h. "Certificate of the officer concerned that he has read Army Regulations 605-230 and fully understands his rights thereunder, including his right to counsel; opportunity to submit his resignation or to request demotion where applicable; and that he understands that he may be discharged as an officer of the Army as a result of reclassification proceedings. #20

i. Report of interview by next higher commander.

The next higher commander considers the papers and reassigns the officer to other duty or forwards the papers to the next higher commander. In case he does not reassign the officer to other duty, his forwarding indorsement must include a statement that reassignment in his command has been considered. This procedure is followed throughout the chain of command until the papers reach the commander having reclassification jurisdiction. In case the officer is reassigned by any commander in the chain of command, the reclassification action is suspended, and the papers are held at the headquarters of the commander reassigning him. The new commander of the officer concerned is advised of the reason for the reassignment, and he is instructed to submit a special efficiency report at a future designated time. If this efficiency report is favorable, the reclassification action is terminated, and the papers are forwarded to the Adjutant General of the Army.

If it is unfavorable, the reclassification action is continued, and the new special efficiency report is added to the papers in the case. The file is forwarded, and the officer concerned is ordered to the Reclassification Center by the commander having authority to issue such an order. The commander having reclassification jurisdiction forwards the file to the Reclassification Board, and the board conducts the formal hearing.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. See Appendix 1.
2. See Appendix 2.
3. See Appendix 3.
4. See Appendix 4.
5. See Appendix 5.
6. See Appendix 6.
7. See Appendix 7.
8. See Appendix 8.
9. See Appendix 9.
10. See Appendix 10.
11. See Appendix 11.
12. See Appendix 12.
13. See Appendix 13.
14. See Appendix 14.
15. Par. 1, AR 605-230, Changes No. 3.
16. Par. 3, AR 605-230.
17. Par. 4, AR 605-230, Changes No. 3.
18. Par. 5, AR 605-230.
19. Par. 7, d, AR 605-230.
20. Par. 7, b, (1), (g), 2, AR 605-230, Changes No. 1.

#### CHAPTER 2

##### RECLASSIFICATION BOARD

10. Reclassification Centers. Each commander having reclassification jurisdiction establishes a reclassification center, consisting of a reclassification board, a board room, the necessary clerical personnel, and office space and equipment to enable the preparation of

the board proceedings and the conduct of the necessary administration.

11. Reclassification Boards. A commander having reclassification jurisdiction convenes a permanent reclassification board, composed of not less than five commissioned officers, one of whom must be a line officer, and one must be a medical officer. In addition, there are one or more recorders without vote and one or more defense counsels. The board members, insofar as practicable, should be senior in permanent and temporary grade to the officers appearing before the board.

12. Efficiency Boards. Reclassification of federally recognized officers of the National Guard of the United States is handled by Efficiency Boards under the provisions of Section 76, National Defense Act as amended.<sup>21</sup> These boards are composed of not less than five officers of the Regular Army or the National Guard of the United States or both, who will be senior in rank, permanent and temporary, to the officer under investigation. The efficiency Board of the European Theater was convened at the Reclassification center and was composed of qualified members of the reclassification board. Its procedure and case records were identical with the procedure and records of the reclassification board in all particulars.

13. Organization of the European Theater of Operations Reclassification Board.<sup>22</sup> Prior to 27 May 1944, the Reclassification Board was composed of seven line and staff officers and one medical officer, and four recorders and counsels. On 27 May 1944, three additional members were assigned to the Board; and on 8 June 1944, four additional recorders were assigned to the Board and attached to corps headquarters operating on the continent. On 22 June 1944, six additional recorders were assigned to the Board, four of whom were attached to corps headquarters on the continent. On 28 July 1944, one additional medical officer, and on 25 August 1944, two additional line officers, were assigned to the Board. The final composition of the Board was twelve line and staff officers and two medical officers, and fourteen recorders and counsels. This membership enabled the Board to operate as two boards, and thereby facilitated the hearing of the large number of cases which were received during the period of military operations on the continent. Eight of the recorders were attached to corps operating on the continent. During September and October 1944, all recorders attached to the corps operating on the continent were relieved of that duty, two being returned to the Board and six transferred to other organizations. Prior to 14 July 1944, no officers or enlisted men were assigned for the purpose of operating the reclassification center, and the president of the Reclassification Board was responsible for the administration, training, and discipline of officers being reclassified. On 14 July 1944, the 6800th Reclassification Center, operating under the Commanding General, Theater Service Forces, was activated, and relieved the Reclassification Board of all administrative, training, and disciplinary matters connected with the officers awaiting reclassification.

14. Procedure of Reclassification Board. Upon reporting to the Reclassification Board, the officer to be reclassified was interviewed by the senior recorder, who determined whether or not he had in his possession a copy of the Form A, and whether he had had an opportunity to secure evidence in his own behalf. If the officer signified that he had not had this opportunity, or that the time allotted him for this purpose was insufficient, this was called to the attention of the President of the Board. The President of the Board then interviewed the officer, and if the distance to his last station was not too great, a recorder was sent to obtain affidavits from the persons designated by the officer concerned. If the distance was so great that the



hearing of the case might be unduly delayed, every effort was made to secure this evidence by correspondence or wire communication, and the case was not heard until he had secured all the evidence available. If the officer did not have a copy of the Form A and supporting papers, the interview by the senior recorder was postponed until the arrival of the file in the case. Upon arrival of the officer and receipt of the file, the file was checked for errors and omissions, and a defense counsel was assigned to assist the officer with his defense. The file was then circulated to those members of the Board designated to hear the case for study. After all members had thoroughly familiarized themselves with the facts, the officer and his counsel appeared before the Board for the informal interview prescribed in Paragraph 12c(1), Army Regulations 605-230. In the event the officer's physical condition became an issue in the case in any way, either through his claim or any inference as to his physical or mental condition contained in the file, the medical member of the Board questioned the officer and made recommendations to the other members as to whether or not the officer should be hospitalized and given a thorough physical examination. If the Board concluded that the officer's physical condition may have contributed to his inefficiency, or that any of the supporting testimony had alleged either physical or mental disability, the officer was immediately sent to the nearest general hospital for a thorough examination. This examination included both physical and psychiatric evaluation. Further action was suspended until the officer's return from the hospital. Upon his return from the hospital, the physical examination and the psychiatric evaluation were included in the file, and the file was again circulated to the members for study. When the hospital report recommended further observation and treatment in the Zone of the Interior, the file was returned to the Theater Commander, under the provisions of Paragraph 12d(7), AR 605-230. In cases in which the officer's physical condition was not made an issue, or in which the report of physical examination was negative, the informal interview was completed, and the Board proceeded to formal hearing at such time as the officer concerned announced his readiness.

15. Formal Hearings. Formal hearings were conducted as prescribed by Army Regulations 605-230 and conformed in general to general court-martial procedures. The officer being reclassified and his defense counsel were present during all open sessions of the Board. A reporter recorded the proceedings, under the supervision of the recorder. After all evidence had been submitted, the Board was closed, and the members of the Board, after careful deliberation, arrived at the findings and recommendations by secret written ballot. One member of the Board, previously designated, prepared that part of the record of the hearing which included the findings of fact, discussion, conclusion, and recommendations; and after approval by the other members, it was included in the record. Upon completion of the record, it was checked by the recorder and the board member who prepared the findings of fact, and was then submitted to the acting president for signature. After signature by the acting president, the record was reviewed by the President of the Board and forwarded to the convening authority as an inclosure to an indorsement on the original letter transmitting the case to the Board.

16. Record of Hearing. The record of the formal hearing followed the form prescribed in Paragraph 17, Army Regulations 605-230. Since the form for the findings of fact, the discussion, the conclusions, and the recommendation is very general and contains no details, the Board determined its own wording. In the early history of the Board, the records of hearings differed considerably in these paragraphs, due to the fact that they were prepared by different members. During the latter part of 1943, however, these paragraphs were strictly formalized, and the entire record was streamlined to the maximum extent. The

findings of fact and the conclusions were reduced to a few sub-paragraphs, formally worded to cover the particular case. The discussions were brief but were sufficient to defend the conclusions and to show the line of reasoning by which the Board arrived at the conclusions. Although in Paragraph 17, Army Regulations 605-230, the form prescribes that a summary of all testimony will be included, this was never done by the Reclassification Board of the European Theater of Operations. Instead, all oral testimony was recorded verbatim and was attached to the record as exhibits. A copy of the work sheet on which the findings of fact, discussion, conclusion, and recommendations were prepared is attached as Appendix 15. In all cases the officer concerned was furnished a copy of the record of the formal hearing, exclusive of the findings of fact, discussion, conclusion, and recommendations.

17. Action of the Board.<sup>23</sup> During the period from 1 June 1943 to 1 June 1945, the European Theater of Operations Reclassification Board disposed of a total of 1,366 cases, of which 90 were Efficiency Board cases. The recommendations of the Board were as follows:

<u>Recommendations</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Separations. . . . .	918	67.2
Honorable discharge. . . . .	428	31.3
Relief from active duty (National Guard and Reserve) . . . . .	13	1.0
Removal from the active list of Regular Army . . . . .	2	.1
Resignation under honorable conditions . . . . .	6	.4
Discharge without specification as to character. . . . .	450	33.0
Discharge of Regular officers under AW 118 . . . . .	3	.2
Resignation under other than honorable conditions. . . . .	16	1.2
Reassigned . . . . .	414	30.3
Reassigned in grade. . . . .	317	23.2
Demoted and reassigned . . . . .	97	7.1
Other recommendations. . . . .	34	2.5
Observation and treatment in army hospital . . . . .	31	2.3
Return for trial by court-martial. . . . .	3	.2

The following tables show reclassification proceedings in the European Theater by grades, services, and months:

<u>Grades</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Colonels	18	1.3
Lieutenant Colonels	94	7.0
Majors	93	7.0
Captains	255	18.5
First Lieutenants	377	27.5
Second Lieutenants	529	38.7
TOTAL	<u>1366</u>	<u>100.0</u>

<u>Services</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Field Forces	1059	77.4
Army Service Forces	115	8.5
Army Air Forces	192	14.1
TOTAL	<u>1366</u>	<u>100.0</u>

194319441945

June	2
July	5
August	21
September	14
October	15
November	15
December	21

January	15
February	13
March	25
April	18
May	44
June	44
July	56
August	104
September	56
October	183
November	158
December	120

January	112
February	99
March	106
April	72
May	48

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

21. See Appendix No. 1.
22. European Theater of Operations Reclassification Board Historical Report.
23. Ibid.

### CHAPTER 3

#### CAUSES OF RECLASSIFICATION

18. Causes of Reclassification.<sup>24</sup> In order to fully study reclassification of officers in the European Theater and to discuss the operations of the Reclassification Board, it is desirable to examine briefly the causes of officers' failure and reclassification. Those cases resulting from physical causes have already been discussed in Paragraph 14 and will not be further discussed here.

a. Lack of Personality Traits. A large percentage of the cases heard by the Board prior to the commencement of operations on the Continent, and even a considerable percentage subsequent to that date, were in this category. In general, the traits of character included are those which, though they may be modified by training and experience, must be considered as being due to factors beyond the control of the officer. The most important ones are lack of leadership and force, combined with a lack of initiative and aggressiveness. In general, it was found that officers reclassified for these reasons were conscientious, hard working, and willing, but, because they lacked the qualifications mentioned above, were simply unable to get the desired results or to provide successful combat leadership. Often they were somewhat weak types, indecisive, and lacking the common sense and good judgment required to successfully lead a unit in combat. A great many officers in this category can be improved by training and experience and by serving under strong superiors. However, as a general rule, these officers are of no value as combat leaders and are quite likely to be of little value in non-combat assignments. The Board considered in all such cases that the officer's unsatisfactory performance of duty was not due to his own fault or neglect, and concluded that his service should be rated as having been honest and faithful. The action taken by the Board in cases involving lack of personality traits was generally a recommendation for an honorable discharge from his commission, or in the case of Reserve or National Guard officers whose age and length of service qualified them, relief from active duty. Careful consideration was given to the possibility of reassignment to other types of

duty, and this was done when his civilian experience warranted such action.

b. Lack of Professional Qualifications. Most of the cases in this group were the result of failure in combat, and they usually followed a definite pattern. The officer, after being commissioned, was assigned to duty not connected with the training of combat troops, such as duty with a service school or replacement training center. While on this duty, he received ratings of "Excellent" and "Superior" and in many cases received one or more promotions. These officers, after serving from six months to several years on this type of duty, were then assigned to duty overseas, and upon arrival in the theater of operations were assigned immediately to an experienced combat unit and went into combat as commanders without real training or experience in combat leadership. Failure in such cases is inevitable, except in rare cases where the officer is so outstanding in personality and leadership as to overcome his handicap of training and experience. In such cases, the Board recommended additional training where possible, and in others a reduction in grade and reassignment in a subordinate capacity for the purpose of reducing responsibilities and acquiring the necessary experience.

c. Classification Failure. This group includes a considerable number of cases in which officers of undoubted qualifications and experience along certain lines were, through failure to consider records as contained in their qualification card, WD AGO Form 56-1, assigned to duties for which they were not qualified. This often occurred in cases where officers of one branch or with specialty qualifications were transferred to other branches and assigned to command combat units. In such cases, the Board, where possible, recommended reassignment to duties for which they were qualified, and in rare cases recommended return to the Zone of the Interior where their attainments could be utilized. In some cases of this type, the Board recommended further training in the duties to which they were last assigned.

d. Lack of Adaptability. Many officers, considered under the category of "Lack of Personality Traits", might have been listed under this heading. The type referred to here is the officer who, although intelligent and well-educated and possessing other professional qualifications, is of such temperament and disposition, through no fault of his own, as to be unable to adapt himself to the restrictions and requirements of the military service. This type of officer was usually the older, more mature man with a specialized education or profession. It was exemplified by chaplains, medical officers, and other specialized services. They had had little or no contact with the military service prior to their entry on active duty. In such cases, the only action open to the Reclassification Board was to recommend an honorable discharge.

e. Selection Failure. This group includes the rather small number of officers who are completely lacking in officer qualifications and should never have been commissioned. Such officers are usually lacking in education and in intelligence, combined with a lack of personality traits and of other professional qualifications. This failure, as in others considered above, is often not discovered until the officer is confronted with the problems of leadership, although it is believed that more careful screening of officer candidates at the source would have prevented the commissioning of many men of this type. As these officers' failure was not due to their own fault and neglect, the only action left to the Board was a recommendation for honorable discharge.

f. Lack of Physical and Mental Stamina, and Lack of Moral Fibre. Because of their close relationship and the narrow line of demarcation between them, cases under these categories will be discussed together. The phrase "lack of moral fibre" was first used in the European Theater of Operations by the Army Air Forces to describe officers who refused to fly

combat missions because of failure to control their fear for their personal safety. The Reclassification Board adopted the term to cover cases of like nature arising in combat in both the air and ground forces. It is to all practical purposes synonymous with "Cowardice". The term "lack of physical and mental stamina" has been applied by the Reclassification Board to those cases in which the officer concerned failed in his mission as a combat leader through combat exhaustion or through inherent physical and mental weaknesses beyond his power to control. As stated above, the line of demarcation between these cases is very narrow, and it is extremely difficult in many cases to determine the category under which a case should fall. The facts surrounding both types of cases are quite often the same, and the determining factor is whether or not the officer has engaged in prolonged combat, or has been subjected to unusually harrowing conditions to the extent that he is no longer able to withstand the rigors and hardship incident thereto. Cases of "lack of physical and mental stamina" are easily distinguished, when the officer has performed in an excellent manner over an extended period in combat and then suddenly fails in his performance of duty. This is usually due to combat exhaustion. In such cases, the officer was recommended for reassignment to non-combat duty, provided his condition was such as to permit continuance on active duty or that he was qualified for such duty. In all cases where the officer's condition was such as to render him unsuitable for further active duty, he was recommended for honorable discharge. "Moral fibre" cases are those cases in which the officer refused or failed to perform his assigned duties in combat because of an abnormal fear for his personal safety. In these cases, the medical member was of great value to the Reclassification Board. If any doubt arose as to the physical and mental condition of the officer, he was sent to a general hospital for a physical examination and a psychiatric evaluation. If the physical examination and the psychiatric evaluation found the officer to be normal and fit for full duty, the Board concluded that his failure was due to factors over which he had full control, and therefore that his service had been other than honest and faithful. In all cases of this nature, except three, the Board recommended that the officer be discharged without specification as to the character thereof. In the remaining three cases, the officers' actions were such that the Board recommended that they be returned to their organization for trial by court-martial. However, in these three cases, due to the length of time since the offense was committed and the uncertainty as to whether the witnesses were available, the recommendations of the Board were disapproved by the Theater Commander, and the records were forwarded recommending discharge without specification as to the character thereof.

g. Psychoneurosis. Another type of "physical and mental stamina" case was that of the officer whose condition was diagnosed as "psychoneurosis", and in which the psychiatric evaluation showed him to have been predisposed to this condition and to have possessed a low tolerance to combat prior to entry into the military service. Usually this type officer failed early in combat and was immediately relieved. This type could also be included with the selection failures. Because of their low tolerance, they were not considered for reassignment to non-combat duty and were recommended for honorable discharge. The condition of a large percentage of the officers appearing before the Board because of "lack of moral fibre" had been diagnosed as "psychoneurosis" in one of its forms, and in many cases where such a diagnosis had been established, indications of abnormality were found in their files. Although the presence of psychoneurosis does not necessarily refute an implication of cowardice, it presents a problem of considerable gravity that is difficult to solve. It is concerned principally with the determination of whether the officer in a psychoneurotic of long standing, or whether his condition is a recent development. Many factors enter into cases of this nature, such as the type of individual, personal and family background, predisposition, stress tolerance, stress including length and severity of combat, marital trouble,

and other pressure. A second problem seen much less frequently is the definite psychosis. Almost without exception in these cases, reclassification was initiated and the officer reported to the Reclassification Board without having received an adequate physical examination. In most of these cases, the officer's mental condition was so evident that it should have been noticed by anyone having contact with him. In all cases in which an officer's physical or mental condition was an issue in the case, a thorough physical examination and, if possible, a psychiatric examination as soon as possible after his relief from duty, would have been of great assistance to the Reclassification Board.

h. Avoidable Undesirable Habits and Traits of Character. The number of cases in this category was comparatively small and consisted of officers who were chronic alcoholics or who were lazy and negligent and through their own fault failed to carry out their assigned missions. In some cases the honesty and the morals of the officers were questionable. Many of the officers had been tried by court-martial or disciplined under Article of War 104. This type of officer was considered to be of no further value to the service, and they were recommended for discharge without specification as to the character thereof.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

24. European Theater of Operations Reclassification Board  
Historical Report.

## CHAPTER 4

### RECLASSIFICATION OF FLYING OFFICERS

19. Reclassification of Flying Officers. The reclassification of flying officers received special attention, due to the fact that the Air Force, in order to maintain high morale among flying crews, demanded more drastic action against flying failures than might be expected against officers of ground troops. Of the 165 flying officers reclassified, 161 were under allegations of "lack of moral fibre", and none were for lack of the professional qualifications of a flying officer,<sup>25</sup> as previously stated in Paragraph 18 f, "lack of moral fibre" is defined as inability to satisfactorily perform assigned duties because of fear for one's own personal safety. The policy of the Eighth Air Force was defined in Memorandum 75-2, Headquarters Eighth Air Force, 25 June 1943, as amended on 23 August 1943,<sup>26</sup> and in a letter to the Surgeon, Eighth Air Force, dated 6 July 1943, Subject: "Classification of Psychiatric Disorders among Flying Personnel".<sup>27</sup> The Ninth Air Force, upon its arrival in the European Theater, followed the same general policy. Prior to December 1944, all flying officers being reclassified for "lack of moral fibre" were, in the Report of Physical Examination for Flying, WD AGO Form 64, accompanying the papers, found to be physically disqualified for flying solely because of fear of flying. The Reclassification Board disagreed with and disregarded this portion of the physical examination, and proceeded to formal hearing and findings, on the assumption that the officer was physically qualified for flying. On 7 December 1944, a letter was written by the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, to the commanding generals of all air forces in theaters of operations, Subject: "Lack of Incentive for Flying and Unwillingness or Refusal to Meet Military Stresses",<sup>28</sup> and on 30 December 1944, a memorandum was addressed to Brigadier General Malcolm C. Grow by Colonel George L. Ball, Medical Corps, Headquarters Army Air Forces, Washington, D.D., on this subject.<sup>29</sup> Thereafter the Air Forces in the European Theater no longer found officers physically disqualified for flying solely on the ground of fear of flying. As stated

above, all officers reclassified for flying failure were charged with "lack of moral fibre". This is believed to have been due to the fact that the Air Forces felt that the maintenance of high morale among flying crews demanded the total removal of flying failures, and not reassignment to ground duties. This resulted in a considerable number of "moral fibre" cases, which were in fact "physical and mental stamina" cases. The following example, considered to be an extreme case of this type, is quoted from an Air Force report:30

"A 21 year old pilot was a questionable choice for flying. Both his father and mother were nervous people, and a sister had a nervous breakdown. His early life was remarkable for only mild compulsiveness and perfectionism and in its aimlessness until he became a clerk in a drug store. He did well in this capacity, but during his employment showed one unfavorable trait. On two occasions he was involved in accidents which resulted from his 'freezing'. In primary pilot training he sat paralyzed while in a spin, and the instructor had to recover. He had no sooner entered flying training than he realized that he had made a mistake. His long-held theoretical interest was no match for what was to him an unpleasant reality, and he developed almost immediately a dread of mid-air collisions. On one occasion he nearly collided with one plane while he was fearfully watching another. His fear of collisions broadened, so that he became fearful of landing patterns, formation flying, and then landings themselves. Although he was most anxious to relinquish flight training, he was unable to face the stigma of failure and persisted. When he entered heavy bombardment training, his anxiety interfered so much with his formation flying that his crew protested. He reassured them by stating he would be 'all right in the pinches'. He came to combat as first pilot with 1200 hours flying time, but after two practice missions in which his anxiety was so manifest and so dangerous that his crew went to the commanding officer in protest, he was reclassified as co-pilot. After three relatively uneventful combat missions, his pilot allowed him to land the plane. He tried in his anxiousness to crowd the plane down from an impossible approach and almost crashed it, the pilot taking over. After this he reported to his commanding officer, stating that, although he could force himself into an airplane and fly it, he could not force himself to be cool."

The Reclassification Board did not agree that this type of case was a "moral fibre" case. This officer's personal and family history shows a strong predisposition to mental and moral weakness, and he was a selection failure who should have been eliminated during his flight training. The Reclassification Board considered that failures of this type were due to factors over which the officers had no control, and that therefore they were entitled to an honorable discharge from the service. In the opinion of the Reclassification Board, a typical case of "lack of moral fibre" would be that of an officer whose performance of duty prior to combat was normal in every way, who had little or no predisposition to weakness, but who under mild or moderate stress failed in combat through fear. There were, of course, many border line cases between these two extremes, which were each decided by the facts surrounding the officer's failure and by his manner and attitude before the Board. The presence of an Air Force flying officer at all times as a member of the Board was extremely helpful in handling these cases. In general, Air Force reclassification cases were well prepared and were complete with WD AGO Form 64, report of Central Medical Board and Flying Evaluation Board, and report of psychiatric examination.

25. European Theater of Operations Reclassification Board Historical Report.
26. See Appendix 16.
27. See Appendix 17.
28. See Appendix 18.
29. See Appendix 19.
30. Report of European Theater Air Forces on Reclassification of Officers.

## CHAPTER 5

### DISPOSITION OF OFFICERS

20. Reassignment. The Reclassification Board reassigned in grade 317 officers, or 23.2 per cent of the total cases disposed of during the two-year period from 1 June 1943 to 1 June 1945.<sup>31</sup> In addition, numerous officers, who were sent by divisions or similar units to the Reclassification Center for reclassification, were reassigned by the European Theater Commander without referring the case to the Reclassification Board. A considerable number of these were officers of many years experience and excellent or superior combat records, and who had been decorated for gallantry in action. These officers, because of their age or physical condition, were no longer able to withstand the rigors of combat. Obviously they should have been reassigned to other duties without having been subjected to the stigma of reclassification. This same condition, as previously noted in Paragraph 18 f, applied to many younger officers, who after excellent combat records failed because of "lack of physical and mental stamina". The primary purpose of reclassification is the conservation of manpower by placing officers in the assignment where they are best qualified to serve, before resorting to demotion or elimination. It would have been possible to accomplish this without subjecting the officer to embarrassment or disgrace of any kind. It was not intended in the regulations that stigma should be attached to reclassification. However, in actual practice this is not true. Numerous officers, upon reassignment after reclassification, were made to feel in no uncertain terms that they had "two strikes" on them. The personal interview required by Paragraph 7 (d) 1, Army Regulations 605-230, is made by the next higher commander, who is an interested party, and he usually supports the officer initiating the reclassification. Even, in many cases in which he recommended reassignment, his recommendation was not followed by higher commanders in the chain of command. Forwarding indorsements of higher commanders, stating that "reassignment has been considered and no suitable vacancy exists" for the officer, were too often purely formal, when there were actually suitable vacancies for the officer in the unit. Obviously some steps should be taken to eliminate or to avoid these conditions. The solution appears to be to require commanders to more fully exhaust the possibilities for reassignment before reclassification is considered.

21. Disposition of Officers upon Initiation of Reclassification. Under the provisions of Paragraph 11, Army Regulations 605-230, only the commander having reclassification jurisdiction has authority to order an officer being reclassified to the Reclassification Center. Circular 27, Headquarters European Theater of Operations, 15 March 1944,<sup>32</sup> authorized the commanders of armies, separate corps, air forces, and base sections,



when in a non-operational status, to order officers being reclassified to the Reclassification Center. Paragraph 5 a, Section II, Circular 70, same headquarters, dated 14 June 1944,<sup>35</sup> extended this authority to operational units in the European Theater. This was defined to mean alerted units and units engaged in combat operations against the enemy. In a letter to the Commanding General, 12th Army Group, dated 25 August 1944,<sup>34</sup> the Commanding General, 12th Army Group, was authorized to delegate to units of his command authority to send to his headquarters officers being recommended for reclassification, and thereafter upon receipt of the file to order them to the Reclassification Center. This authority was, by letter dated 18 September 1944,<sup>35</sup> amended to include Army Group units only, and similar authority was delegated by letter to commanding generals of armies. In Paragraph 6, Section III, Circular 95, dated 31 August 1944,<sup>36</sup> the Commanding General, European Theater of Operations, retained authority to order to the Reclassification Center officers being reclassified from static units, defined as units not engaged in combat operations against the enemy, or air force units which have static headquarters in the United Kingdom. Complaints were made by subordinate commanders that too much time was required to rid the unit of undesirable officers after reclassification was initiated. However, the system prescribed in the theater directives was adequate, and delays in ordering officers to army headquarters were caused by the failure of subordinate unit commanders to issue and to require strict compliance with unit directives.

22. Demotion. Demotion of officers in the European Theater of Operations was accomplished in accordance with the provisions of Army Regulations 605-230, except that the Theater Commander retained jurisdiction over demotions. However, in order to maintain uniformity of action, the majority of the recommendations for demotion were handled through reclassification. Most of the exceptions to this rule were cases in which officers voluntarily accepted demotion in lieu of reclassification. Under this system the interests of the Government and the rights of the officers concerned both were fully protected.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

31. European Theater of Operations Reclassification Board Historical Report.
32. See Appendix 5.
33. See Appendix 9.
34. See Appendix 12.
35. See Appendix 13.
36. See Appendix 10.

## CHAPTER 6

### RECORDERS

23. Recorders Attached to Operational Units. Prior to the commencement of operations on the continent, one recorder of the Board was attached to each corps headquarters participating in the offensive, after having received training with the Reclassification Board. These recorders facilitated reclassification proceedings by interviewing each officer returned from the front line units for unsatisfactory performance of duty. The recorders checked the Form 4 and supporting papers, and ascertained

whether or not the papers were properly prepared and whether there was sufficient evidence to support the allegations. The recorders also informed the officers that, if they would submit a list of witnesses from whom they desired statements, every effort would be made to obtain affidavits from them. After interviewing the officer, the recorders visited his unit for the purpose of correcting errors in the Form A and supporting papers, securing further supporting evidence, if required, and affidavits from the witnesses designated by the officer concerned. This arrangement greatly expedited reclassification proceedings, as it insured sufficient evidence to support the allegations and proper preparation of the Form A and supporting papers; and the officers concerned were given full opportunity to obtain evidence in their own behalf. This plan continued until September 1944. At that time, because of the rapid movement, the difficulty in locating the assault units, and the small number of officers being returned for reclassification, this arrangement was discontinued, and the recorders were returned to the Board.

## CHAPTER 7

### CENTRALIZATION

24. Centralization of Reclassification. As previously stated, reclassification jurisdiction was retained by the Theater Commander, and all reclassification in the European Theater was accomplished by a single reclassification board. There are several advantages to this system. It provides uniformity of reclassification procedure and action. It also permits the organization of a permanent full-time board of officers of long experience, which would not be possible in smaller units, and it relieves units in combat of the burden of operating and administering a reclassification center. The reclassification of flying officers presented no special problems and was adequately handled by the Theater Reclassification Board. There was at all times on the Board an experienced Air Force flying officer who kept in close contact with Air Force Headquarters and acted as advisor to the Reclassification Board in Air Force matters. A special reclassification board for the Air Forces was therefore unnecessary.

## CHAPTER 8

### CONCLUSIONS

25. Conclusions. Based upon reclassification practice and procedure in the European Theater of Operations during the period from 1 June 1943 to 1 June 1945, it is concluded that:

- a. Reclassification, as prescribed in Army Regulations 605-230, achieved the desired results in the European Theater of Operations.
- b. The retention of reclassification jurisdiction by the Theater Commander was proper.
- c. Many excellent officers, whose records entitled them to reassignment, were subjected to the stigma of reclassification because of improper application of the regulations.
- d. Reclassification was handled as rapidly as could be reasonably expected, with the exception of a few cases in which excessive delays occurred as a result of faulty administrative methods or failure to comply with regulations.

e. Minor changes in Army Regulations 605-230 are desirable to provide for the following:

- (1) Physical and psychiatric examinations, in appropriate cases, of officers being reclassified,
- (2) Additional documentary evidence to support unfavorable special efficiency reports submitted under the provisions of Paragraph 7 g (3), Army Regulations 605-230.
- (3) Holding officers being reclassified at division or similar headquarters until they have secured all evidence desired for their defense.
- (4) Attaching trained recorders to corps or similar headquarters to assist in the preparation of reclassification cases.

f. The system of handling promotions through reclassification was satisfactory and adequate.

## CHAPTER 9

### RECOMMENDATIONS

26. Recommendations. It is recommended that:

a. No major change be made in the system of reclassification of officers as prescribed in Army Regulations 605-230.

b. Reclassification jurisdiction in active theaters of operations be retained by the theater commanders.

c. Army Regulations 605-230 be changed to provide for:

- (1) The reassignment of officers, whose combat records are excellent or better and who have been relieved from their commands because of combat exhaustion or similar cause, without subjecting them to the stigma of reclassification or being sent to a reclassification center.
- (2) Physical and psychiatric examinations, in appropriate cases, of officers being reclassified.
- (3) Additional documentary evidence to support unfavorable special efficiency reports submitted under the provisions of Paragraph 7 g (3), Army Regulations 605-230.
- (4) Holding officers being reclassified at division or similar headquarters until they have secured all evidence desired for their defense.
- (5) Attaching trained recorders to corps or similar headquarters to assist in the preparation or reclassification cases.

SECTION 76  
THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT  
As Amended

SECTION 76. WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 202), Sec. 76.  
June 15, 1933 (48 Stat. 153), Sec 13.

32:115

Under such regulations as the President shall prescribe, the capacity and general fitness of any officer or warrant officer of the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia for continued Federal recognition may at any time be investigated by an efficiency board of officers senior in rank to the officer under investigation, appointed by the Secretary of War from the Regular Army or the National Guard of the United States, or both. If the findings of said board be unfavorable to the officer under investigation and be approved by the President, Federal recognition shall be withdrawn and he shall be discharged from the National Guard of the United States. Federal recognition may be withdrawn by the Secretary of War and his appointment in the National Guard of the United States may be terminated when an officer or warrant officer of the National Guard of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia has been absent without leave for three months.

Appendix 1

HEADQUARTERS  
EUROPEAN THEATER OF OPERATIONS  
UNITED STATES ARMY

CIRCULAR)

3 July 1942

NO. 11)

EXTRACT

II--RECLASSIFICATION OF OFFICERS.

1. Reclassification of officers will be accomplished in this theater under authority granted in War Department cablegram dated 13 May 1942,

2. The Commanding General, Services of Supply, European Theater of Operations, United States Army, is given the responsibilities and authority specified in AR 605-230 for a corps area commander; he will establish the necessary reclassification centers and appoint and convene such reclassification boards as may be required for this theater.

3. Reclassification procedure will conform to AR 605-230, 20 February 1942, as amended by W.D. Circular #141, 12 May 1942, except that:

a. All requests for reclassification will be forwarded through command channels to Headquarters, European Theater of Operations, United States Army. After a case has been referred to the reclassification board, direct communication is authorized between the board and the commanders concerned.

b. All cases involving discharge, demotion, or removal from the active list, and cases of field officers recommended for transfer to organizations not within the assignment jurisdiction of the Commanding General, Services of Supply, will be forwarded by the Commanding General, Services of Supply, to Theater Headquarters for final approval.

c. A monthly report will be submitted to Theater Headquarters containing a list of officers ordered before reclassification boards during the preceding month, the organization to which each officer belonged, and the recommendation made by the Reclassification Board with the action taken by the convening authority in each case.

4. AR 605-230 provides that reclassification will not be substituted for disciplinary action and that reassignment of officers within the limits of control of each headquarters concerned should be the first step in reclassification of an officer.

HEADQUARTERS  
EUROPEAN THEATER OF OPERATIONS  
UNITED STATES ARMY

CIRCULAR)

15 July 1942

NO. 13)

EXTRACT

I--RECLASSIFICATION OF OFFICERS.

Paragraph 3, Section II, Circular No. 11, 8 July 1942, is amended to read as follows:

3. Reclassification procedure will conform to AR 605-230, 4 June 1942.

\* \* \* \* \*

appendix 1

HEADQUARTERS  
EUROPEAN THEATER OF OPERATIONS  
UNITED STATES ARMY

CIRCULAR)

15 August 1942

NO. 26)

EXTRACT

III--RECLASSIFICATION OF OFFICERS.

1. Section II, Circular No. 11, Hq ETOUSA, 8 July 1942, is rescinded.

2. The Commanding General, ETOUSA, will appoint such reclassification board or boards as necessary for the ETOUSA. The Commanding General, SOS, ETOUSA, will establish the necessary reclassification centers as may be required for this theater.

3. Reclassification procedure will conform to AR 605-230 except that:

a. All requests for reclassification will be forwarded through command channels to this headquarters. After a case has been referred to the reclassification board, direct communication is authorized between the board and the commanders concerned.

b. All cases involving discharge, demotion, or removal from the active list, and cases of field officers recommended for transfer to organizations not within the assignment jurisdiction of the Commanding General, Services of Supply, will be forwarded to this headquarters for appropriate action.

c. A monthly report will be submitted to this headquarters containing a list of officers ordered before reclassification boards during the preceding month, the organization to which each officer belonged, and the recommendation made by the board.

4. AR 605-230 provides that reclassification will not be substituted for disciplinary action and that reassignment of officers as indicated therein should be the first step in reclassification of an officer.

HEADQUARTERS  
EUROPEAN THEATER OF OPERATIONS  
UNITED STATES ARMY

Cir 16

17 Feb 1943

E X T R A C T

1. RECLASSIFICATION OF OFFICERS. 1. Sec I, Cir 13, Hq ETOUSA, 15 July 1942, and Sec III, Cir 26, Hq ETOUSA, 15 Aug 1942, are rescinded. Reclassification of officers in this theater will be accomplished in accordance with the provisions of AR 605-230, 24 Dec 1942, and of this circular.
2. Purpose. The purpose of reclassification is to provide a means whereby officers may be utilized to the best advantage of the Government or eliminated from the service if unsuitable. Reclassification is not a disciplinary procedure. Reclassification is not to be used in lieu of trial by court-martial or punishment under AW 104. Under no circumstances will reclassification be substituted for disciplinary action.
3. Reclassification jurisdiction. a. The Commanding General, ETOUSA, has reclassification jurisdiction by virtue of specific designation from the War Department.
- b. The reclassification center will be established at or near Hq ETOUSA. The membership of the reclassification board appointed by the convening authority will be representative of ground forces, air forces, and services of supply.
4. Procedure prior to reference to reclassification board. a. Before formal action is begun, full consideration will be given to reassignment within divisional or comparable units. If such reassignment results in satisfactory utilization of the officer, formal action will not be initiated. If such reassignment does not result in satisfactory utilization of the officer, formal action may be commenced by a commander who considers that an officer of his command is not performing satisfactorily the duties to which he is assigned, and the initiating commander will state in the recommendation (Form A) the reasons why reassignment was not made.
- b. All the supporting papers required to initiate formal action will be in duplicate, with the exception of WD AGO Form 66-1. All the supporting papers will be executed under oath, with the exception of such formal documents as the recommendation (Form A), the special efficiency report, and WD AGO Form 66-1. The recommendation (Form A) will be addressed to the Commanding General, ETOUSA, and it together with all the other supporting papers will be forwarded through command channels.
- c. Intermediate commanders who do not terminate the formal action by reassigning the officer to other duty will add to their forwarding endorsements a statement of the reasons why reassignment was not made by them.
- d. In event the formal action is terminated by reassignment by an intermediate commander, WD AGO Form 66-1 will be removed from the record. Extract copies of such form will be prepared and substituted in each of the duplicate records. The original Form 66-1 will be forwarded to the appropriate headquarters of the officer's new organization.
5. Procedure after reference to reclassification board. a. Officers who are the subject of reclassification action will not proceed to the reclassification center until so ordered by the Commanding General, ETOUSA.
- b. Direct communication is authorized between the board and the commanders or other sources of evidence concerned. (AG 210.1 OCS)



HEADQUARTERS  
EUROPEAN THEATER OF OPERATIONS  
UNITED STATES ARMY

Cir 68

27 Aug 1943

\* \* \* \* \*

E X T R A C T

I--RECLASSIFICATION OF OFFICERS. 1. Sec I, Cir 16, Hq ETOUSA, 17 Feb 1943, is rescinded. Reclassification of officers will be accomplished in accordance with the provisions of AR 605-230, 9 June 1943.

2. Recommendations for reclassification of officers will be addressed to the Commanding General, ETOUSA.

3. In each case, the initiating commander will state in the recommendation for reclassification: a. the reason why reassignment was not made; b. explanation in detail of reasons for the recommendation, based on Par 2, AR 605-230, 9 June 1943; and c. (where applicable) full explanation and statements prescribed by Par 4, AR 605-230. Intermediate commanders who do not terminate the formal action by reassignment will add to their forwarding indorsements a statement of the reason why reassignment was not made.

4. All supporting papers prescribed by Par 7b, AR 605-230, will be prepared and forwarded in duplicate. Duplicate copies will be either signed or certified as true copies.

5. In event formal action is terminated by reassignment by an intermediate commander, the original WD AGO Form 66-1 will be forwarded to the appropriate headquarters of the officer's new organization.

6. Direct communication is authorized between the board and commanders or other sources of evidence concerned.

7. Action on all reclassification cases will be expedited. In order to eliminate delay occasioned by administrative preparation of reclassification cases, additional recorders have been appointed to the reclassification board for the purpose of assisting commanding officers in preparing reclassification files. The president of the reclassification board will provide, upon call of a commanding officer desiring such assistance, the services of a board recorder. (AG 210.01 XGa)

II--DEMOTION OF OFFICERS WITHOUT INITIATING RECLASSIFICATION PROCEEDINGS:

1. Except as provided in Sec III below, demotion of officers without reclassification board action will be accomplished in accordance with the provisions of Par 8, AR 605-230, 9 June 1943.

2. Recommendations will be addressed to the Commanding General, ETOUSA.

3. Each recommendation for demotion will contain the following information: a. Name, branch, and serial number of the officer concerned.

b. Present temporary grade, to be identified either as AUS or as AUS-AG. In the case of an officer holding a temporary Air Corps grade, there will be included also a statement of any temporary AUS grade held which is lower than the temporary Air Corps grade and higher than the officer's permanent grade in the Regular Army, National Guard, or Officers' Reserve Corps.

c. Permanent grade in Regular Army, National Guard, or Officers' Reserve Corps, or a statement that the officer holds no such permanent appointment.

d. A statement supported by detailed recital of the evidence: (1) That the officer is obviously unfitted for his temporary grade.

(2) That the officer is desirable or acceptable in a lower grade in the command of the general officer who initiates the recommendation, or in the command of a higher general officer through whom such recommendation is routed.

(3). That in the event action involves complete severance of the officer from the service, the officer concerned has indicated his willingness to

accept reappointment in an appropriate lower grade.

(4) That the demotion requested is not punishment in lieu of action under court-martial procedure or under provisions of AW 104. (AG 210.26 XGA)

III--DEMOTION OF OFFICERS WHEN MORALE AND EXAMPLE REQUIRE. 1. Sec II, Cir 16, Hq ETOUSA, 17 Feb 1943, and Sec III, Cir 32, 23 Mar 1943, are rescinded.

2. The Commanding General, ETOUSA, has been specifically authorized by War Department letter, 9 Jan 1943, Subject: "Authority to Demote", to demote officers when, in contact with the enemy, or when such contact is considered imminent, morale and example may require.

3. Purpose. The foregoing additional method of demotion will be utilized only when an officer fails to perform satisfactorily the duty of his higher temporary grade under such circumstances that morale and example require demotion by the most expeditious means possible, e.g., where the failure occurs under such circumstances as to affect seriously the morale of others, or materially to influence others from the proper performance of their duties. Where such considerations of morale and example are not substantially involved, AR 605-230, 9 June 1943, is applicable. The foregoing additional method of demotion is not a disciplinary procedure nor a substitute for disciplinary action.

4. Procedure. a. Request for demotion under the authority set forth in Par 2 above will be a written communication signed by the commanding officer next subordinate to the Commanding General, ETOUSA, in the chain of command over the subject officer. (For example, any such request as to an officer of any organization within the Eighth Air Force will be made by written communication signed by the Commanding General, Eighth Air Force.) The preparation of such request for the signature of the requesting commander will be expedited by such departures from normal channels and means of communication within ETOUSA as are deemed advisable.

b. Each such request will contain the following information: (1) Name, branch, and serial number of the officer concerned.

(2) Present temporary grade. This will be identified either as AUS or AUS-AC. In the case of an officer holding a temporary Air Corps grade, there will be included also a statement of any temporary AUS grade held which is lower than the temporary Air Corps grade, and higher than the officer's permanent grade in the Regular Army, National Guard, or Officers' Reserve Corps.

(3) Permanent grade in Regular Army, National Guard, or Officers' Reserve Corps, or a statement that the officer holds no such permanent appointment.

(4) A statement, supported by detailed recital of the evidence: (a) That the officer is not performing satisfactorily the duty of his present temporary grade.

(b) That said failure occurs under such circumstances that morale and example require demotion by most expeditious means possible.

(c) That the demotion requested is not punishment in lieu of action under court-martial procedure or under provisions of AW 104.

(d) That the conditions and circumstances are such that the provisions of AR 605-230, 9 June 1943, would not be equally effective and desirable.

(e) That in the event action involves complete separation of the officer from the service, the officer concerned has indicated his willingness to accept reappointment in an appropriate lower grade. (AG 210.26 XGA)

\* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

E X T R A C T

- 1--RECLASSIFICATION OF OFFICERS. 1. Sec 1, Cir 63, 27 Aug 1943, is rescinded. Reclassification of officers will be accomplished in accordance with the provisions of AR 605-230, 9 June 1943, as changed; WD Cir 230, 5 Nov 1943; and this circular.
2. Recommendations for reclassification of officers will be addressed to the CG, ETOUSA.
3. In event that formal action is terminated by reassignment by an intermediate commander, the original WD AGO Form 66-1 will be forwarded to the appropriate headquarters of the officer's new organization.
4. Direct communication is authorized between the board and commanders or other sources of evidence concerned.
5. a. Under the authority contained in Par 7b(2)(b), C 1, AR 605-230, commanding officers of operational units only within this theater (i.e., alerted units and units engaged in combat operations against the enemy) are authorized to depart from the procedure prescribed by WD directives for the transfer to reclassification centers of officers recommended for reclassification. In cases arising within such operational units, commanding officers may order the officer concerned to the reclassification center after compliance with Par 7b(1)(a), (b), (c), (d), and (f), C 1, AR 605-230, 5 Nov 1943. In such case, the forwarding indorsement to this headquarters will state that the officer has been ordered to the reclassification center and a copy of the orders directing such action attached.
- b. The reclassification board will be responsible in such cases, should the officer concerned appear before it, that the requirements of Par 7b(1)(e) and (g), C 1, AR 605-230, 5 Nov 1943, are fully and completely satisfied. In exceptional circumstances, subject officer will be afforded an opportunity to return to his former station for the purpose of obtaining additional evidence in his own behalf. The certificate of the officer will be obtained by the board and attached to the record.
6. Recorders and defense counsel have been appointed to the reclassification board for the purpose of assisting officers in preparing reclassification files. The president of the reclassification board will provide, upon call of a commanding officer desiring such assistance, the services of a board recorder or defense counsel. (AG 210.01 PerGA)
- \* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

E X T R A C T

II--RECLASSIFICATION OF OFFICERS. 1. Sec I, Cir 95, 6 Dec 1943, is amended as indicated:

a. Par 6 is renumbered as Par 8.

b. A new Par 6 is added, reading:

"6. When in a non-operational status, the commanders of armies, separate corps, air forces and base sections are authorized to order officers concerned to the reclassification center when the initiating commander has complied with Par 7b, AR 605-230, as amended by Changes No. 1 (including Par 7b(1) (c) and (d), and has forwarded the supporting papers to the next higher commander. In each such case, the forwarding endorsement to this headquarters will state that the officer has been ordered to the reclassification center, and a copy of the orders directing such action will be attached."

c. A new Par 7 is added, reading:

"7. Officers placed on temporary duty at the reclassification center under the provisions hereof may be carried as surplus, pending final disposition, and vacancies may be considered as being created." (AG 210.01 (PGA))

\* \* \* \* \*

Appendix 8

\* \* \* \* \*

E X T R A C T

II--RECLASSIFICATION OF OFFICERS. 1. Sec I, Cir 95, 6 Dec 1943, and Sec II, Cir 27, 15 Mar 1944, are rescinded. Reclassification of officers will be accomplished in accordance with the provisions hereof and of AR 605-230, 9 Jun 1943, as amended, and Sec I, Cir 280, WD, 5 Nov 1943.

2. Recommendations for the reclassification of officers will be addressed to the CG, ETOUSA, and will be submitted so as to insure receipt at this headquarters in quadruplicate (all copies to be either signed or certified as true copies).

3. In the event that formal action is terminated by reassignment by an intermediate commander, the original WD AGO Form 66-1 will be forwarded to the appropriate headquarters of the officer's new organization.

4. Direct communication is authorized between the board and commanders or other sources of evidence concerned.

5. a. Under the authority contained in Par 7b(2)(b), AR 605-230, as amended, commanding officers of operational units only within this theater (i.e., alerted units and units engaged in combat operations against the enemy) are authorized to depart from the procedure prescribed by WD directives for the transfer to reclassification centers of officers recommended for reclassification. In cases arising within such operational units, commanding officers may order the officer concerned to the reclassification center after compliance with Pars 7b(1)(a), (b), (c), (d), and (f), AR 605-230, as amended. In such cases, the forwarding indorsement to this headquarters will state that the officer has been ordered to the reclassification center, and a copy of the orders directing such action will be attached.

b. The reclassification board will be responsible in such cases, should the officer concerned appear before it, that the requirements of Pars 7b(1)(e) and (g), AR 605-230, as amended, are fully and completely satisfied. In exceptional circumstances, the subject officer will be afforded an opportunity to return to his former station for the purpose of obtaining additional evidence in his own behalf. The certificate of the officer will be obtained by the board and attached to the record.

6. When in a non-operational status, the commanders of armies, separate corps, air forces and base sections are authorized to order officers concerned to the reclassification center when the initiating commander has complied with Par 7b, AR 605-230, as amended (including Pars 7b(1)(c) and (g)), and has forwarded the supporting papers to the next higher commander. In each such case, the forwarding indorsement to this headquarters will state that the officer has been ordered to the reclassification center, and a copy of the orders directing such action will be attached.

7. Officers placed on temporary duty at the reclassification center under the provisions hereof may be carried as surplus, pending final disposition, and vacancies may be considered as being created.

8. Recorders and defense counsel have been appointed to the reclassification board for the purpose of assisting officers of the board in preparing reclassification files. The president of the reclassification board will provide, upon call of a commanding officer desiring such assistance, the services of a board recorder or defense counsel. (AG 210. 210.01 MPGA)

\* \* \* \* \*

31 Aug 1944

\* \* \* \* \*

E X T R A C T

- III--RECLASSIFICATION OF OFFICERS. 1. Sec II, Cir 70, 14 Jun 1944, is rescinded. The reclassification of officers will be accomplished in accordance with the provisions hereof and of AR 605-230, 9 Jun 1943, as amended, and Sec I, Cir 280, WD, 5 Nov 1943.
2. Recommendations for the reclassification of officers will be addressed to the Commanding General, European Theater of Operations, US Army, and will be submitted so as to insure receipt at this headquarters in quadruplicate (all copies to be either signed or certified as true copies).
3. In the event that formal action is terminated by reassignment by an intermediate commander, the original WD AGO Form 66-1 will be forwarded to the appropriate headquarters of the officer's new organization.
4. Direct communication is authorized between the Reclassification Board and commanders and other appropriate sources of evidence.
5. The reclassification procedures authorized for units engaged in combat, which have non-static headquarters, are prescribed in separate letters of instructions issued to armies, air forces and base sections.
6. Officers recommended for reclassification who are members of static units (i.e., units not engaged in combat operations against the enemy or air force units engaged in combat which have static headquarters in the UK) will be ordered to the Reclassification Center only by this headquarters, and only after the receipt by this headquarters of their files in an administratively correct status.
7. Officers placed on temporary duty at the Reclassification Center under the provisions hereof may be carried as surplus, pending final disposition, and vacancies may be considered as being created. (AG 210.01 HPGa)
- \* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

E X T R A C T

VI--RECLASSIFICATION OF OFFICERS. Sec III, Cir 95, 31 Aug 1944, is amended as indicated:

1. Par 6 is amended to read:

"6. Officers recommended for reclassification who are members of units attached or assigned to a command not specifically authorized to order officers to the Reclassification Center will be ordered thereto only by this headquarters and only after the receipt at this headquarters of their files in an administratively correct status."

2. New Pars 8 and 9 are added thereto, reading, respectively:

"8. Commands of the field forces or air forces specifically authorized by this headquarters to return officers to the Reclassification Center will, upon full compliance with the instructions contained in the letter of authorization, dispatch officers to be reclassified to the nearest Communications Zone section headquarters for movement to the Reclassification Center. The Section Commanders receiving such personnel are charged with the responsibility of providing for their transportation, by the most expeditious means, to the Theater Reclassification Center."

"9. In accordance with the provisions of Par 7d(4), AR 605-230, 9 Jun 1943, as amended by Changes No. 3, 7 Aug 1944, command channels for the purpose of reclassification, in the case of activities and organizations operating under other than Tables of Organization and Equipment, are defined as the routing of such cases through all intermediate commanders having administrative jurisdiction. Coordination with interested agencies not in such channels will be effected by this headquarters upon receipt of the reclassification file."

(AG 210.01 MPGA)

\* \* \* \* \*

HEADQUARTERS  
EUROPEAN THEATER OF OPERATIONS  
UNITED STATES ARMY

AGO 887  
25 August 1944

AG 201.01 WPOB

SUBJECT: Reclassification Procedure.

TO: Commanding General, Twelfth Army Group, APO 655.

1. Letter, this headquarters, file AG 210.01, 30 May 1944, Subject: "Procedure for Reclassification of Officers of Units Engaged in Combat", is rescinded.
2. Under combat conditions, you may delegate to units of your command, in whatever echelon is deemed appropriate, authority to send to your headquarters unsuitable officers for whom reclassification is recommended.
3. An officer recommended for reclassification may be ordered to the Reclassification Center after receipt of the file at your headquarters and full compliance with Par 7b, AR 605-230. Concurrent with the ordering of officer to the Reclassification Center, you will forward completed file to this headquarters, APO 887, through normal command channels. In such cases, the forwarding indorsement to the headquarters will state that the officer has been ordered to the Reclassification Center, and copies of the orders directing such action will be attached.
4. In order that the Reclassification Board may have the proper basis on which to formulate its recommendation, it is essential that statements made in "Form A" of the reclassification file be supported by factual data rather than hearsay evidence.
5. Existing theater requirements in conflict with the above are modified accordingly.

By command of General EISENHOWER:

/s/ R. B. Lovett  
/t/ R. B. LOVEIT  
Brigadier General, USA  
Adjutant General



HEADQUARTERS  
EUROPEAN THEATER OF OPERATIONS  
UNITED STATES ARMY

ABL/BJM/zh

18 September 1944

AG 210.01 (MPGA)

SUBJECT: Reclassification Procedure.

TO: Commanding General, Twelfth Army Group, APO 655.

Letter, this headquarters, file AG 210.01 WPCB, Subject: "Reclassification Procedure", dated 25 August 1944, to Commanding General, Twelfth Army Group, is amended by changing Paragraph 2 thereof to read as follows:

"2. You are authorized under combat conditions to delegate to Army Group units of your command, authority to send to your headquarters unsuitable officers for whom reclassification has been recommended. This authority is not applicable to armies assigned to your command; separate similar authority having been delegated to them."

By command of General EISENHOWER:

/s/ R. B. LOVETT  
Brigadier General, USA  
Adjutant General

Appendix 13

HEADQUARTERS  
EUROPEAN THEATER OF OPERATIONS  
UNITED STATES ARMY

ARC/RJW/eh

4 October 1944

AG 210.01

SUBJECT: Procedure in Reclassification Cases.

TO: President, European Theater of Operations Reclassification Board, Headquarters, Brittany Base Section, APC 517.

1. General Eisenhower personally signed the message quoted below, which will be brought to the immediate attention of all members of the Reclassification Board, and other personnel on duty at the Reclassification Center handling reclassification cases:

"1. When officers are relieved from duty because of failure in combat or leadership, all concerned, including Reclassification Board, will be very careful not to hound tactical commanders for a mass of detail.

2. A comprehensive written statement from a man's commanding officer, concurred in by a senior and giving, if possible, the opinion of that type of duty for which the officer may be considered satisfactory, should be sufficient.

3. I do not want to appear too arbitrary or unjust, but we cannot have combat commanders working hours at a time to prepare long lists and detailed affidavits and reports which after all are meaningless if the commanding officer has lost confidence in the subordinate who is being relieved."

2. It is desired that you insure the spirit of this directive is fully complied with at all times and that every possible effort be made to:

a. Correct at the board any technical errors possible to adjust without a return of papers.

b. Avoid return of papers for relatively minor corrections or additions when there is sufficient information available on which reasonable action can be taken by the board.

c. A similar letter has been dispatched to the President of the Board at 871.

By command of General EISENHOWER:

A. H. CORLEY, Jr.  
Lt. Col., AGP,  
Assistant Adjutant General.

a. Findings of Fact:

- (1) (a) Case was referred to the Board by \_\_\_\_ Ind, Hq ETOUSA, \_\_\_\_\_ 45.
- (b) Subject officer reported to the Board pursuant to Ltr O, Hq ETOUSA, \_\_\_\_\_ 45. (Ex. A)
- (c) He was notified of Formal Hearing on \_\_\_\_\_ 45. (Ex. B)
- (d) He acknowledged receipt of Form A and supporting documents \_\_\_\_\_ 45. (Ex. )
- (e) He was afforded full opportunity to secure evidence in his own behalf on \_\_\_\_\_ 45. (Ex. )

- (2) Civilian History: Subject officer is \_\_\_\_ years old.

(Exs. \_\_\_\_\_ )

- (3) Military Record:

(Exs. \_\_\_\_\_ )

- (4) (a) He was (un)satisfactory and (in)efficient in the assignment forming the basis for initiation of reclassification.
- (b) He (is) (is not) qualified, professionally (and) (or) otherwise, to hold (his present) (any) commission.
- (b) He lacks moral fibre in that he is unable to properly perform his assigned duties in combat because of abnormal fear.
- (b) He possesses avoidable undesirable (habits) and (traits) of character which render his retention in the service as an officer undesirable.
- (b) He lacks the mental and physical stamina required of an officer in combat.
- (b) He lacks military proficiency in that he does not possess \_\_\_\_\_.
- (b) He

(Exs. \_\_\_\_\_ )

- (5) There (is) (is no) evidence of disqualifying physical disability.

(Ex. \_\_\_\_ and Oral Testimony)

b. Discussion: (See attached sheet)c. Conclusions:

- (1) Subject officer has (no) (little) potential value to the service as an officer.

- (2) He (is) (is not) physically disqualified.  
(3) His service (has) (has not) been honest and faithful.  
(4) He should be: ( ) Retained in the service in (present) (a lower) grade.  
( ) Separated from the service because he lacks the mental and physical stamina required of an officer in combat.  
( ) Separated from the service because of lack of military proficiency.  
( ) Separated from the service because of a lack of moral fibre.  
( ) Separated from the service because of undesirable habits and traits of character.

Check one

Recommendations: In view of the above the Board recommends that:

-----REASSIGNMENT-----

\_\_\_\_\_' \_\_\_\_\_' \_\_\_\_\_' \_\_\_\_\_'  
(Grade) (Name) (ASN) (Arm)

be reassigned in grade for duty with \_\_\_\_\_  
(Arm or Service)  
in accordance with paragraph 12d(1) (a and c), AR 605-230, 9 June 43.

-----HONORABLE DISCHARGE-----

(1) \_\_\_\_\_' \_\_\_\_\_' \_\_\_\_\_' \_\_\_\_\_'  
(Grade) (Name) (ASN) (Arm)

be separated from the service, not as a result of physical disability, and that,

(2) He be honorably discharged from the service, pursuant to the provisions of Par 12d(b)(b)1, AR 605-230, 9 June 43.

-----DISCHARGE-----

(1) \_\_\_\_\_' \_\_\_\_\_' \_\_\_\_\_' \_\_\_\_\_'  
(Grade) (Name) (ASN) (Arm)

be separated from the service, not as a result of physical disability, and that,

(2) He be discharged from the service pursuant to the provisions of Par 12d(b)(b)2, AR 605-230, 9 June 43.

-----DEMOTION AND REASSIGNMENT-----

\_\_\_\_\_' \_\_\_\_\_' \_\_\_\_\_' \_\_\_\_\_'  
(Grade) (Name) (ASN) (Arm)

be demoted to the grade of \_\_\_\_\_ and reassigned for duty with \_\_\_\_\_  
(Arm or Service)  
9 June 43.

HEADQUARTERS EIGHTH AIR FORCE  
Office of the Commanding General

MEMORANDUM)

23 August 1943

NO. 75-2)

COMBAT CREW PERSONNEL FAILURES

Memorandum 75-2, dated 25 June 1943, this headquarters, is rescinded.

1. The purpose of this Memorandum is to prescribe disposition of Combat Crew personnel who are unsuitable for further combat duty because of lack of moral fibre, or because of operational exhaustion.

2. Procedure: - a. The immediate Commanding Officer of any individual who is unsuitable for further combat duty because of either of the reasons cited in Par 1 above will determine, assisted by his Unit Flight Surgeon, which of the cited reasons is applicable. If determination is doubtful, the individual accompanied by a full case history, will be ordered to the 302nd Dispensary at Station 101 for Medical Board determination. Determination will be expedited and reported to the Unit Commander by the Medical Board. Report will include whether treatment is indicated. If treatment is not recommended, or upon completion of treatment, the individual will be returned to his unit without delay.

b. If the reason for failure is determined to be lack of moral fibre, the immediate Commanding Officer will take the following action:

(1) Officers: Under appropriate circumstances--

- (a) Initiate demotion (of officers holding temporary higher grade) under pertinent ETO Circulars.
- (b) Initiate reclassification proceedings under AR 605-230, and pertinent ETO Circulars.
- (c) Take action in accordance with Par 2, Sub-par 12, AR 35-1480, suspending the officer from flying status.
- (d) Initiate court-martial proceedings.
- (e) No one of the above actions bars the other actions all or any one of which are available.

(2) Enlisted Men: Reduce to grade of private, remove from flying status, take disciplinary action where appropriate, and assign to basic duty.

c. If the reason for failure is determined to be operational exhaustion not susceptible to rehabilitation, the immediate commanding officer will take the following action:

(1) Officers: Reassign to appropriate duty other than combat, or report to higher headquarters as excess. If reported as excess, the report will be accompanied by AGO Form 66-1, and will include amplifying remarks according to the personal knowledge of the reporting officer.

(2) Enlisted Men: Relieve from combat duty assignment, remove from flying status, and either assign to other than combat duty or report to higher headquarters as excess. If reported as excess, the report will be accompanied by

AGO Form 20 and will include amplifying remarks according to the personal knowledge of the reporting officer.

3. Reclassification proceedings for officers who have failed in combat duty (because of lack of moral fibre) will not involve reassignment. Action on such proceedings will be expedited by all intervening headquarters.

4. The provisions of this memorandum are not applicable to combat crew personnel who have failed because of lack of adequate technique or training. Neither will such personnel be sent to the Medical Board for examination.

5. Any existing instructions contrary to the provisions of this memorandum are rescinded.

By command of Major General EATER:

C. C. CHAFFIN,  
Brigadier General, U. S. A.  
Chief of Staff.

OFFICIAL:

/s/ H. G. Culton  
/t/ H. G. CULTON,  
Colonel, A.G.D.,  
Adjutant General.

DISTRIBUTION: "C"

Appendix 16

6 July 1943

SUBJECT: Classification of Psychiatric Disorders among Flying Personnel.

TO: The Surgeon, Headquarters Eighth Air Force, APO 633, U.S. Army.

1. The great majority of psychiatric breakdowns among combat flyers are anxiety syndromes of one sort or another. They can be classified from a practical point of view as follows:

- a. Fear Reactions.
- b. Functional symptoms in direct response to combat stress.
- c. Character Neuroses.

2. Fear Reactions. This term implies a sudden and transient anxiety phenomenon which arises on anticipation of or during combat and which disappears when the individual is removed from combat. It is, then, a reaction in response to a specific condition, and a reaction which ceases when the specific condition (combat) stimulating it ceases. In cases to date it has been characterized by trembling, sweating, nausea, feelings of weakness, inability to concentrate, and all in all a condition which prevents any degree of efficiency on the part of the man.

3. Functional symptoms in direct response to combat stress. By this phrase is meant the individual who develops any one of the classical types of neurosis (anxiety, state, hysteric, neurasthenia, obsessive-compulsive state) when he is exposed to combat. In cases to date the combat has precipitated (or possibly caused) this syndrome, usually an anxiety state, during the course of the first few missions. Unlike the Fear Reaction, this condition is more cumulative and is slower in disappearing when the man is taken off combat, and may not disappear for many months. These individuals usually give no positive previous history of overt emotional difficulties, are generally regarded as average "normals" until they go on combat and then break down, and in whom it is likely that such a syndrome would never have developed if they had not been exposed to combat flying.

4. Character Neuroses. This term describes the "born" neurotic, who has had neurotic symptoms long prior to military service, and who represents poor selection (by present available methods) in the first place. Combat aviation may aggravate the symptoms he already possessed but in other cases may not even do that. This is the long term "character neurosis" of civilian life and will be present whether or not the man is retained on combat status.

5. From the standpoint of disposal, and specifically related to decisions made by the Central Medical Board, the following is suggested. The syndromes described in Paragraph 2 and 3 represent emotional conditions caused or wholly precipitated by fear of combat participation. Therefore, since it is supposed that they would not have occurred if the individual had not been exposed to combat, they must infer a lack of moral fibre and should be referred back to the Group for administrative action.

The Character Neuroses (Paragraph 4) on the other hand have antedated military service, and indeed may not even be aggravated by

Ltr, Hq 8th AF, 6 Jul 43 (Continued).

combat. It is suggested that these individuals be sent to a General hospital with the intention that they be separated from the military service on medical grounds.

EDWARD J. TRACY  
Colonel, Medical Corps,  
President, Central Medical Board

WILLIAM E. JACKSON  
Major, Medical Corps,  
Member, Central Medical Board

DONALD W. HASTINGS  
Major, Medical Corps,  
Member, Central Medical Board

Appendix 17

- 2 -



HEADQUARTERS, ARMY AIR FORCES  
WASHINGTON

AAF Ltr (C) 35-18

7 December 1944

SUBJECT: Lack of Incentive for Flying and Unwillingness or Refusal to Meet Military Stresses.

TO: Commanding Generals, All Air Forces in Theaters of Operations.

1. The Commanding General, AAF, desires that all commanding officers of his command be advised of, and be thoroughly familiar with, his thoughts on the subject of lack of incentive for flying and unwillingness or refusal to meet military stresses. He desires that flying officers who have exhibited such traits of character or change in attitude toward the wholehearted performance of their flying mission be disposed of in accordance with policies outlined herein. To implement the above and for the purpose of clarification, this communication is divided into two sections: Administrative Considerations and Medical Considerations.

Section I - Administrative Considerations

2. Rated officers who are performing unsatisfactory flying duty will be referred by the unit commander to the station or unit flight surgeon for a physical examination for flying. Dependent upon the results of this physical examination, action will be taken as follows:

- a. If found physically disqualified for flying, the individual may be grounded, recommended for temporary suspension, or recommended for indefinite suspension by his unit commander as authorized in AAF Regulation 35-16.
- b. If found physically qualified for flying, the individual will be ordered to appear before a local Flying Evaluation Board. This board will consider the case within twenty-one days of receipt of such finding with due regard for policies of the Commanding General, AAF, as outlined herein.
- c. If the station or unit flight surgeon cannot determine the physical qualification of the individual for flying duty, the unit or station commander will request orders from the air force or AAF independent command headquarters for the individual to appear before the Central Medical Examining Board.
- d. If the individual is found physically disqualified for flying duty by the Central Medical Examining Board, disposition of the case will be as ordered by the commanding general of the air force or AAF independent command, subject to the provisions of the AAF Regulation 35-16.
- e. If the individual is found physically qualified for flying duty by the Central Medical Examining Board, the commanding general of the air force or AAF independent command will order the individual to appear before a Local Flying Evaluation Board which will consider the case within 21 days of the receipt of such directive. If review of the proceedings of the Local Flying Evaluation Board by the commanding general of the air force or AAF independent command in such cases indicates that the evidence furnished in support of the action recommended contains insufficient justification, or if the commanding general of the air force or AAF independent command does not concur in the

action recommended, the individual may be ordered to appear before the Central Flying Evaluation Board. It is expected that the actual appearance of individuals before the Central Flying Evaluation Board for new hearings will be kept to a minimum. To accomplish this, it will be absolutely necessary that Local Flying Evaluation Boards be properly indoctrinated. Central Flying Evaluation Boards will not be allowed to become boards of appeal from the recommendations of Local Flying Evaluation Boards.

3. Action in the disposition of officers of the AAF who exhibit a lack of incentive for flying and unwillingness or refusal to meet military stresses will be guided by consideration of the following policies:

- a. Nothing in this letter relating to the re-evaluation of rated officers will be construed as applying to a rated officer of mature judgment and extensive service. It is reasonable that senior officers whose primary duties for a period of years have been other than flying, may have lost some incentive for flying.
- b. Usually a young, inexperienced officer on flying status has been commissioned solely for the purpose of accomplishing flying duties. When such an officer exhibits a lack of incentive for flying, he ordinarily ceases to be of any value to the service as an officer, inasmuch as he is unable to perform satisfactorily the duties for which he was commissioned, and consideration of his elimination is indicated.
- c. When a rated officer on flying status refuses to fly, or refuses to fly the airplane to which he is assigned, he will be requested to so state in writing over his signature. If this cannot be accomplished, statements for consideration of the Flying Evaluation Board must be secured from personnel who have heard the refusal.
- d. Cases of suddenly developed physical ailments, which upon medical examination, are found to have no demonstrable organic basis and those cases of sudden lack of ability to accomplish flying duties must be carefully studied. With all of the facts presented and carefully weighed, the Flying Evaluation Board must find the officer disqualified for flying duties, if such finding be appropriate, because of professional deficiency or character deficiency -- not because of a combination of the two.
- e. Immediately following Flying Evaluation Board findings which state that the officer possesses "undesirable habits or traits of character", "lack of fundamental courage", or similar facts, reclassification board proceedings will be initiated without waiting for higher headquarters to act on the findings and recommendations of the Flying Evaluation Board.
- f. Every officer appearing before a Flying Evaluation Board or reclassification board must be allowed to exercise his rights as set forth in AR 420-5. However, there can be no hesitancy shown in the proper disposition of such officer as fail to measure up to accepted standards.
- g. An officer who is removed from flying status because of physical reasons, or for reasons where lack of incentive for flying has not been the controlling factor, may be reassigned

to administrative duties if his education, experience, or skill indicates that he will be of continued use as an officer.

11. Lack of incentive for flying as a result of harrowing experiences incident to flying is essentially a medical consideration, be reason of which an individual may be physically disqualified. Thus, harrowing experiences having been taken into account in the determination of the individual's physical qualifications for flying, ordinarily should not be considered again by a Flying Evaluation Board.
- i. Inasmuch as administrative officers are not ordinarily subject to the hazards and pressure faced by officers on flying status, it is recognized that unwillingness or refusal to accept military stress by these officers will have less of an extenuating basis. When officers in this category exhibit such undesirable traits, action will be taken at once to accomplish their elimination from the service.
- j. When an officer has exhibited unwillingness, or refuses, to meet the stresses imposed by military situations, and evidence indicates that his elimination from the service as an officer is in the best interest thereof, action will be initiated recommending him for reclassification under the provisions of AR 605-230 with a view towards his separation from the service. Such officers may also be afforded an opportunity to voluntarily resign under the provisions of AR 605-275. Reclassification action or resignation will be initiated and accomplished in accordance with existing AAF instructions. However, in flagrant cases of refusal to fly, serious willful violations of flying regulations, and other appropriate cases, strong disciplinary action such as General Court-Martial is indicated.

4. Suspensions from flying will not be accomplished as a punitive measure for offenses cognizable by courts-martial or the 104th Article of War. However, immediate consideration will be given to the flying status of any rated officer who is ordered to appear before a General Court-Martial. If the offense for which he is being tried is of such nature as to reflect upon his judgment and professional fitness for flying to the extent that he is considered unfit for flying, he should be suspended from flying immediately and ordered to appear before a Flying Evaluation Board. In cases of this nature, recommendations of Flying Evaluation Boards will be based only upon consideration of the individual's professional fitness for flying.

5. In all cases where an officer is sentenced by a General Court-Martial to dismissal from the service, he is considered unfit for flying and will be suspended immediately from flying status pending final action on the sentence. Cases of this nature will be reported to this headquarters for confirmation of the suspension from flying status in accordance with procedure established in AAF Regulation 35-16.

6. In conclusion, the Commanding General, AAF, desires to stress that solution of the problem of unwillingness or refusal to meet stresses imposed by military situations is basically a function of command. Every effort will be exerted by all echelons of command to develop a sense of moral responsibility in individual flyers and to maintain a high level of morale by frequent discussions led by experienced and mature flyers, squadron commanders, group commanders, and others who have had a considerable amount of combat experience, and by any other appropriate means. Command-

ing officers will not subject officers of their command to disproportionate degrees of stress beyond the necessity of the military situation. Commanding officers and flight surgeons will deal considerably and tactfully, but firmly, with all rated flying personnel.

## Section II - Medical Considerations

7. When a rated individual on flying status indicates by actions, by complaint of symptoms, or by his own request that he is unable to continue flying duty, or that he has flying difficulties which may be associated with his state of health, he will be required by his unit commander to undergo a physical examination for flying. In the process of conducting the physical examination, the reference of the individual to the chiefs of major professional services of available medical facilities, for purpose of consultation, will be accomplished when considered appropriate.

8. When the physical qualifications of an individual for flying duty can be clearly determined, the commanding officer of the station or unit will be notified of the exact findings of the flight surgeon, viz., the individual is physically qualified for flying; the individual is physically disqualified for flying for the following reasons: " \* ". Further action and disposition of medical records in such cases will be in accordance with AAF Regulation 35-16.

9. When the physical qualification for flying of an individual is in doubt or is difficult to ascertain, he will be recommended by his unit commander for reference to an appropriate Central Medical Examining Board for further study. Rated flying personnel who evidence undesirable habits or traits of character, inherent personality deficiencies, or extremes in temperamental behavior which repeatedly interrupt or seriously interfere with accomplishment of required flying duties will be ordered before a Central Medical Examining Board if, in the opinion of the commanding general of the major command, the case should be considered by this body. Decisions concerning cases in which medical judgment is obvious and physical qualification or disqualification is unquestionable will be the responsibility of the unit commander. Central Medical Examining Boards will not be used as boards of appeal from decisions rendered by local commanding officers. In cases of individuals who are ordered before Central Medical Examining Boards, such military reports and/or clinical records concerning these individuals, which will be of primary interest to the board, will be forwarded to the president of the board. Such records will include a certificate from the individual's unit commander that flying duty performed by the individual is unsatisfactory, a statement as to why and how unsatisfactory; a complete history of the development of the individual's complaint; the unit surgeon's evaluation of the individual's adaptability for flying duty; and relevant statement made by crew members as to the individual's performance under stress; and a copy of a WD AGO Form 64 examination accomplished sometime within the preceding 30 days.

10. The decision as to whether an individual having certain psycho-neurotic tendencies will be suspended from flying duty on a basis of medical disqualification or whether, notwithstanding the presence of minimal psychiatric symptoms, he will be certified as physically qualified for flying and suspended on an administrative basis is a decision of utmost importance. The removal from flying duty for medical reasons establishes, from the individual's viewpoint, a justification for his inability to accomplish such duties satisfactorily. To permit this false impression to remain, when no actual illness exists, will result in further difficulties in accomplishing subsequent action in reassignment and disposition of the individual. The decision as to the manner of suspension also, to a considerable degree, can have a definite influence on whether reclassification

procedures are to be initiated. Physical disqualification establishes a history of an illness or the presence of a physical disability, which may or may not be incident to flying duty and which undoubtedly can be used as a substantiation for a claim for compensation if such individuals are under consideration for separation from the military service on the basis of physical incapacity for such service. The finding that an individual is physically incapacitated for flying duty, whether determined to be limited to duty "yes" or "no", although not physically incapacitated for duty not involving flying, does not prevent the initiation in appropriate cases of reclassification action, in accordance with the provisions of AR 505-230.

11. Central Medical Examining Boards will be guided by the following instructions in considering an evaluation of an individual's fitness for flying duty:

- a. Unless findings justify a definite diagnosis of psychosis or severe psychoneurosis, minimal psychiatric symptoms or mild psychosomatic reactions will not be made a basis for physical disqualification for flying duty. In the absence of other disqualifying factors, individuals who manifest such symptoms or reactions will be considered as being physically qualified for flying duty. In the absence of a medical history of major nervous or mental disease, in the absence of major psychiatric findings, or in the absence of a history of subjugation of the individual to extremely harrowing situations or experiences beyond average anticipated tolerance, the declaration or manifestation of the following reactions to flight will not be considered reason for physical disqualification for flying duty:

- (1) Fear of combat flying.
- (2) Fear of flying a particular type aircraft.
- (3) Fear of close formation flying.
- (4) Fear of high altitude flying.
- (5) Fear of instrument flying.
- (6) Fear of over-water flying.
- (7) Fear of night flying.

It is recognized that such statements as above on the part of the individual may frequently occur as the earliest manifestations of a severe emotional illness which may result later in extreme inefficiency in the air. In this event, the total situation in addition to the symptoms will be the basis of the clinical evaluation. Rated personnel subjected to considerable combat experience will be accorded lenient consideration. Consideration also must be given to rated Air Corps officers of mature years whose abilities and judgment have been proved and who are able to fulfill functions expected of an officer of their rank for which aeronautical ratings are granted. It is recognized that because of normal aging processes certain more mature rated officers will feel themselves physically incapable of piloting certain types of aircraft. Declining to pilot such aircraft must not be construed as fear of flying.

12. In considerations of physical qualification for flying duty, Central Medical Examining Boards will obtain and weight the following factors:

- a. Previous Psychological Health. If a rated individual gives a history of a neurosis which existed prior to entrance to flying training, but has withheld this pertinent information during previous examinations, or if he has had previous neu-

rotic symptoms, the significance of which he was not aware, an interpretation must be made as to the severity of his present symptoms or psychosomatic reaction in relation to his past history. If he has had no substantiated evidence of previous, definite emotional or mental disturbances and his present behavior, is such that it would appear that he is avoiding the responsibilities of flying duties as a result of lack of courage, physical disqualification for flying duty will not be recommended unless there is a major co-existing illness. If minor or noncontributing physical illness coexists, a waiver will be recommended and the disposition of the individual will be considered on an administrative basis. In general, individuals having a predisposition for the development of purely subjective symptoms or psychosomatic reactions when subjected to the stress of average flying duties, who never the less, have not had such symptoms when not required to perform these duties, may be considered as physically qualified for flying. In these cases, deficiencies of personality or temperament preclude their useful service in a flying capacity. These, then, properly are subjects for action by the Flying Evaluation Board.

- b. Flying Stress. The severity and quantity of situations or experiences which precipitated an anxiety concerning flying must be evaluated in comparison with the usual quality and quantity of stress which all rated personnel may be expected to encounter. If the traumatic experience has been particularly harrowing or the individual has reached the limit of his individual tolerance, subsequent to completing a reasonable number of missions, although not entirely completing a full tour of combat duty, he will be treated as a medical case. Consideration will be given to rated personnel who have made a serious effort to continue in combat duty in spite of marked psychosomatic reactions as a result of fear.
- c. Response to Rest and Treatment. The response of individuals to rest periods and to specialized psychiatric care will be a factor in considering the disposition of rated personnel. If an individual exhibits a continued severe anxiety which persists under treatment, even though suspended from flying for a considerable period of time, and apparently suffers from a conflict between his sense of duty and his fear of death so that he has continued psychiatric manifestations, he will be considered physically disqualified for flying. The disposition of those found physically disqualified for flying will be accomplished by appropriate medical authority and given every assistance to recover their flying stamina. Every effort will be made to assist rated personnel with their personal difficulties and to supply appropriate specialized medical care when necessary.

15. In reiteration of the main considerations above, medical officers must base the decision of physical qualification or disqualification for flying duty not alone on a survey of the individual's external attitudes or symptoms, but upon information accumulated subsequent to a careful period of observation study, and determination of the following:

- a. Previous psychological history.
- b. Flying stress experienced.
- c. Type and intensity of the emotional change.
- d. Response to rest and definitive treatment.

14. Central Medical Examining Boards will limit their findings to an opinion as to whether the individual is physically qualified or physically disqualified for flying duty in the capacity of the aeronautical rating held and an opinion as to the appropriate disposition of the case from the medical viewpoint. The report of the proceedings of the Central Medical Examining Board will be forwarded to the commanding general appointing the board who will take appropriate action concerning the individual. When a rated individual is ordered to appear before a Flying Evaluation Board, either local or central, after having appeared before a Central Medical Examining Board, the report of the latter board will be made available to the Flying Evaluation Board concerned and will constitute a part of its records and proceedings.

15. The contents of this letter will not be given distribution beyond AAF organization commanders and interested flight surgeons and aviation medical examiners.

For the Commanding General, Army Air Forces:

BARNEY L. GILES

Lieutenant General, United States Army  
Deputy Commander, Army Air Forces, and  
Chief of Staff

Appendix 18

HEADQUARTERS, ARMY AIR FORCES  
WASHINGTON

30 December 1944

MEMORANDUM FOR: Brigadier General Malcolm C. Grow.

With reference to our recent discussion on AAF Regulation 35-16, I believe that the following background concerning the development of this regulation will clarify some of the points discussed.

In establishment of Central Medical Boards, it was never intended that such boards would in any way relieve unit or station flight surgeons of their responsibility to make judgments regarding medical qualifications of individuals for flying duty. A Central Medical Examining Board is not intended to be used as a board of appeal or an agency to which undesirable or unpleasant cases could be referred merely to relieve a unit flight surgeon from making judgments which he is well qualified to do. However, the Central Boards were intended to be a special, professional agency available to the Commanding General of an Air Force or independent command for use in the further examination or evaluation of flying personnel for whom the Commanding General desired additional study or evaluation.

There occur many cases of flying officers who are physically disqualified for flying and who, at the same time as a result of a Flying Evaluation Board action, are recommended for reclassification. Reclassification board proceedings are held and recommendations are made for reduction in grade or for separation from the service. When such board proceedings are reviewed at higher War Department levels, such as the Secretary of War's Separation Board, the reviewing authorities go over the material of the board in detail and search for any material whereby the reclassification proceedings may be considered unjust. When a medical record is found, indicating an officer is physically disqualified for flying duty, the member of these boards are of the opinion that the individual should not have been ordered to participate in flying duty if physically disqualified. The board is then returned disapproved with a recommendation that he be utilized within the troop basis of the AAF in his present grade.

It is, therefore, important that the testimony and content of board proceedings, such as Flying Evaluation Boards and reclassification boards, contain concise, exact information which will not be misleading to reviewing authorities nor be a questionable point whereby the reviewer believes the recommended action is unjust to the individual. Therefore, in the evaluation of a flying officer it is important that we observe him for a considerable period of time in order that a definite opinion may be made as to his physical qualification or disqualification for flying. It is believed appropriate to order before a Central Medical Examining Board those cases which are likely to be placed before a reclassification board and eventually recommended for separation from the military service. The testimony of the specialist members of the Central Medical Boards present a thorough medical examination less liable to refutation at a later date than a less detailed examination accomplished by a flight surgeon of lesser professional experience. The retention of these cases on a temporarily suspended basis during periods of hospitalization or duty not involving flying should be made until a definite opinion is formed in regard to the manner of permanent suspension from flying duty. When a decision is made that the individual is permanently medically disqualified for flying duty, his defect or reason of incapacity should be recommended in firm convincing terms in order that there is no question of the disqualification. Conversely, when a decision is made that the individual is physically



qualified for flying duty and many individuals of equal physical capacity have been required to complete a tour of duty, the testimony on the medical record in regard to the minor incapacitating defects should be minimal. Use of statements such as psychoneurosis, moderate or mild; psychopathic personality, etc., should be deleted from this medical record, unless the General Medical Board desires the individual to be considered a medically disqualified flier and not subject to reclassification or separation proceedings.

/s/ GEORGE L. BALL,  
Colonel, MC.

Appendix 19